



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,694	06/27/2003	Charles H. Gale	50584/GSL/G486	7677
23363	7590	02/27/2007	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068			MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2851		

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,694	GALE, CHARLES H.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher E. Mahoney	2851	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date Jun 2003, Feb 2004.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2 and 5-11 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,773,110. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patented claims anticipate the currently pending claims.

Claims 3-4 and 12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,773,110 in view of Meis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6427034). U.S. Patent No. 6,773,110 teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the backing sheet with a plurality of optical fibers which may be attached to nearly any surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 2851

the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Meis for the purpose of repositionability and proper alignment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takubo (US 4407437).

In reference to claim 1, Takubo discloses a camera stabilizer, ref. 50, comprising: a platform having a first end connectable to a camera and a second end extending outwardly from the first end rest to rest on a shoulder of a camera operator, col. 4. lines 35-40; a handle, ref. 4, locked/connectable to the platform having camera controls contained thereon; and means for transmitting camera control signals from the handle to a signal receiving port on the camera, col. 4 lines 15-29 and 46-52. Takubo discloses wherein the handle is locked to the platform by having a locking pin biased from the handle into a bore in the platform, col. 6 lines 31-36.

In reference to claims 6 and 8, Takubo discloses wherein the means for transmitting the camera control signals is a signal bore extending through the platform, col. 6 lines 37-57. (The remote control is the trigger setup disclosed.)

Art Unit: 2851

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takubo (US 4407437) in view of The Zoom Commander™ (internet printout).

In reference to claim 9, Takubo discloses the limitations of the parent claims as disclosed above. Takubo does not disclose a removable remote control. The Zoom Commander™ discloses a removable remote control that is attachable to a camera platform with a shoulder brace, see page 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that The Zoom Commander™ could be attached to the camera brace of Takubo. The Zoom Commander™ would be attached to the brace of Takubo in order to provide more control over the many functions that are standard on today's cameras.

Claims 2-5, 7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takubo (US 4407437) in view of The Zoom Commander™ (internet printout) and further in view of Meis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6427034).

Takubo in view of The Zoom Commander™ discloses the limitations of the parent claims as disclosed above. It not discloses where the means for transmitting camera control signals comprises a fiber optic fiber. Instead The Zoom Commander™ discloses the control signals are transmitted through a wire connection, see page 2. teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the backing sheet with a plurality of optical fibers which may be

attached to nearly any surface. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Meis for the purpose of repositionability and proper alignment.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Djane Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2399. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

Application/Control Number: 10/607,694
Art Unit: 2851

Page 6

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



CHRISTOPHER MAHONEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER